



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/743,988

12/22/2003

Joshua M. Kopelman

357044.00003

9050

78905

7590

10/01/2008

Saul Ewing LLP (Philadelphia)

Attn: Patent Docket Clerk

2 North Second St.

Harrisburg, PA 17101

EXAMINER

SHEIKH, ASFAND M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3627

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/01/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/743,988	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KOPELMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Asfand M. Sheikh	<b>Art Unit</b> 3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/26/2004 and 5/14/2004</u> .                                 | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-19, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nahan et al. (US 5,664,111) in view of Stack (US 6,076,070).

#### Claim 1, 3-19 and 21-24

**[claims 1, 16, 18, and 21]** Nahan discloses computer-implemented method for pricing goods of independent sellers using a marketer controller capable of communicating via a communications network, the marketer controller including a CPU and a memory operatively connected to the CPU, the method comprising the marketer controller (see at least, abstract and col. 13, lines 13-28): receiving from an independent seller, via the communications network, data identifying the independent seller's good (see at least, col. 2, lines 38-59).

Nahan fails to disclose querying a vendor's controller, via the communications network, to determine the vendor's price for a comparable good; and deriving a sale price for the good from the vendor's price using a predetermined method.

Stack discloses querying a vendor's controller, via the communications network, to determine the vendor's price for a comparable good (see at least, col. 2, lines 34-50

Art Unit: 3627

and col. 3, line 45-53 and col. 4, lines 31-33); and deriving a sale price for the good from the vendor's price using a predetermined method (see at least, col. 2, lines 34-50 and col. 3, line 45-53 and col. 4, lines 31-33) and **[claims 3 and 19]** wherein the seller agrees, before the sale, to sell the good at a sale price determined by the marketeer proximate a time of sale of the good to the buyer, the sale price being determined in accordance with the predetermined method (see at least, col. 2, lines 34-50 and col. 3, line 45-53 and col. 4, lines 31-33) and **[claim 4]** wherein deriving the sale price comprises equating an index price to the vendor's price of the comparable good (see at least, col. 3, lines 40-43: the examiner notes if the "competitor's price is lower" to be an index price) and **[claims 5, 8, and 9]** wherein the seller's good is used and has a certain universal product code (UPC) or International Standard Book Number (ISBN) code, and the comparable good is new and has an identical UPC or ISBN (see at least, col. 4, lines 35-39) and **[claim 6]** wherein the querying is performed responsive to the receiving of the identifying data (see at least, col. 2, lines 34-50 and col. 3, line 45-53 and col. 4, lines 31-33) and **[claims 7 and 17]** wherein the predetermined method for deriving the sale price of the independent seller's good is set by the marketeer controller (see at least, col. 2, lines 34-50 and col. 3, line 45-53 and col. 4, lines 31-33) and **[claims 10 and 11 and 25]** wherein the predetermined method comprises discounting the index price for the comparable good to determine the sale price for the independent seller's good (see at least, col. 2, lines 34-60 and col. 3, line 45-53 and col. 4, lines 31-33) and further with respect to [claim 11] the examiner notes that discounting based on the index price is a matter of design choice and can be set by any parameter used for

Art Unit: 3627

calculating a discount (e.g. 10% the difference of the competitor price based on a price match) and [claim 12] wherein the querying is performed responsive to receiving from a buyer, via the communications network, an expression of interest in purchasing the good (see at least, col. 2, lines 34-60 and col. 3, line 45-53 and col. 4, lines 31-33and col. 4, lines 35-39) and **[claims 13-15 and 22-23]** wherein the expression of interest is a standard identification code identifying the good and wherein the standard identification code comprises a universal product code (UPC) or International Standard Book Number (ISBN) (see at least, col. 2, lines 34-60 and col. 3, line 45-53 and col. 4, lines 31-33and col. 4, lines 35-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Nahan to include querying a vendor's controller, via the communications network, to determine the vendor's price for a comparable good; and deriving a sale price for the good from the vendor's price using a predetermined method as taught by Stack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to assure a customer that they are getting the best price available for goods and/or services ordered through the network (see at least, Stack, col. 2, lines 27-31).

Art Unit: 3627

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nahan et al. (US 5,664,111) in view of Stack (US 6,076,070) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Woolston (US 6,202,051 B1)

### Claim 2

Nahan in view of Stack discloses querying and deriving steps being performed responsive to receiving from the buyer, via the communications network, an expression of interest in purchasing the good, whereby the sale price is derived proximate a time of sale of the good to the buyer (see at least, Stack, col. 2, lines 34-50 and col. 3, line 45-53 and col. 4, lines 31-33: the examiner notes similar motivation to combine as above) however Nahan in view of Stack fails to disclose presenting the good in a marketplace as an item for sale at an unidentified price, the marketplace being accessible to a buyer via the communications network; and presenting the good for sale in the marketplace at the sale price.

Woolston discloses presenting the good in a marketplace as an item for sale at an unidentified price, the marketplace being accessible to a buyer via the communications network and presenting the good for sale in the marketplace at the sale price (see at least, abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Nahan in view of Stack to include presenting the good in a marketplace as an item for sale at an unidentified price, the marketplace being accessible to a buyer via the communications network and presenting

Art Unit: 3627

the good for sale in the marketplace at the sale price as taught by Woolston. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to allow users to speculate on the price of collectable or used goods in an electronic market place (see at least, Woolston, col. 2, lines 3-8).

Art Unit: 3627

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nahan et al. (US 5,664,111) in view of Stack (US 6,076,070) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Reuhl et al. (US 5,873,069)

Claim 20

Nahan in view of Stack fails to disclose wherein the querying is performed proximate a time that the independent seller registers the good with the marketer as a good offered for sale by the seller.

Reuhl discloses wherein the querying is performed proximate a time that the independent seller registers the good with the marketer as a good offered for sale by the seller (see at least, col. 3, lines 40-57: the examiner notes when an item would be added it would be compared to the market and priced accordingly).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Nahan in view of Stack to include wherein the querying is performed proximate a time that the independent seller registers the good with the marketer as a good offered for sale by the seller as taught by Reuhl. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide a comparison among competitors on the product of interest or a substantially similar competitor product (see at least, Reuhl, col. 1, lines 30-38).



***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asfand M. Sheikh whose telephone number is (571)272-1466. The examiner can normally be reached on 9a-5p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan M. Zeender can be reached on (571)272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Asfand M. Sheikh/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3627  
September 25, 2008

/F. Ryan Zeender/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627